

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

**U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090**

PUBLIC COPY



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

B5

DATE: MAR 06 2012 OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in cursive ink.

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will summarily dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner seeks classification pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2), as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree. The petitioner seeks employment as a physician specializing in hematology/oncology. The petitioner asserts that an exemption from the requirement of a job offer, and thus of a labor certification, is in the national interest of the United States. The director found that the petitioner qualifies for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, but that the petitioner has not established that an exemption from the requirement of a job offer would be in the national interest of the United States.

On the Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, counsel checked a box reading “My brief and/or additional evidence is attached.” Counsel did not indicate that any future supplement would follow. Therefore, the initial appellate submission constitutes the entire appeal. The petitioner submitted no exhibits on appeal except for a copy of the denial notice.

The Form I-290B includes a space for the petitioner to “[p]rovide a statement explaining any erroneous conclusion of law or fact in the decision being appealed.” Counsel states:

The record reflects through [the petitioner’s] leading roles at prominent medical institutes along with his history of original and pioneering publications and significant contributions to the field of hematology and oncology that [the petitioner] has demonstrated that (1) his work has had substantial intrinsic merit; (2) the impact of his work has spread beyond his hospital community and had a significant national influence in improving healthcare; and (3) [the petitioner’s] abilities are extraordinary and stand above his peers, such that a waiver of the labor certification process would be in the national interest.

Counsel does not elaborate as to the nature of the claimed “leading roles” and “significant contributions.” The director, in the denial notice, had questioned earlier, similar claims by counsel. Counsel cannot rebut the director’s findings simply by repeating the vague assertion that the petitioner’s work has been important.

In a separate statement accompanying the appeal form, counsel asserts “clear evidence was submitted showing that in particular [the petitioner] has made great contributions to the field through both research work as well as clinical abilities, both well attested to by both his peers with whom he has worked as well as independent testimonials.” The director considered the witness statements in the denial notice, but did not find them sufficient to establish eligibility. Counsel does not address the director’s concerns, instead simply commenting on the letters’ presence in the record.

Counsel states that the petitioner “performs unique life-saving expert clinical procedures . . . which are not performed [by] most other Hematologists and Oncologists. He has developed novel clinical

management guidelines. . . . Also, he is currently the lead on many clinical research trials.” The director, in the denial notice, acknowledged these factors but found that the petitioner had not credibly demonstrated that his achievements set him apart from others in his specialty. Simply to repeat these claims on appeal does not rebut the director’s findings.

Counsel acknowledges that the medical societies to which the petitioner belongs do not require outstanding achievements, but states that “this is the norm.” The director, however, did not raise the issue of memberships as a basis for denial, and therefore this assertion is irrelevant.

In sum, counsel does not explain how the director failed to take the petitioner’s previous evidence into consideration. Counsel does not allege any specific factual or legal errors or other deficiencies in the director’s decision. Counsel, in effect, merely asserts that the director should have approved the petition, which is not a sufficient basis for a substantive appeal.

Because counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the AAO must summarily dismiss the appeal.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.